

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-8, 24, and 29-31 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6-8, 24, and 29-31 have been rejected. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 6-8, 24, and 29-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koppolu (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,458). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 6-8, 24, and 29-31 are allowable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Independent claims 1 and 24 include features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art, namely, as represented by claim 1:

A unified user interface for an application comprising:

one or more component tables, wherein each component table corresponds to a component of the application, each component table includes at least one command for the corresponding component, and each component table includes a description for adding the command to the user interface, wherein each command has an associated priority; and

a master table merged from the one or more component tables, said master table includes available command and available command vectors for the application, **each command and command vector having a unique object identifier and a flag specifying visibility**, and said master table comprising at least one information element from among the following information elements: available commands including commands that are not menu commands; available command vectors including command vectors that do not correspond to menus commands; commands that are on toolbars; and commands that map to keystrokes.

Koppolu purports to teach systems and methods for generating a merged menu list using a conflict resolution protocol (Koppolu, Abstract). The conflict resolution protocol includes container menus of a container application and server menus of a server application (Id.). The container application has a container object and a container window environment, and the server application has a containee object which is contained within the container object (Id.).

Koppolu fails to disclose each command and command vector having a unique object identifier and a flag specifying visibility, as taught by independent claim 1. There is no

mention of commands or command vectors having flags specifying visibility anywhere in Koppolu.

In the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner states that “it was well known in the computer art that Koppolu suggests the feature.” Applicants respectfully disagree that it is well known in the art that Koppolu suggests such a feature and request that the Examiner provide evidence that Koppolu suggests such a feature, or that such a feature was well known in the art.

In addition, the Examiner states that “[i]n the Koppolu’s system, the selected commands (under file menu) are displayed in black color, while other commands are displayed in gray color. The flags specify visibility or invisibility of their commands.”(Office Action, page 4). Applicants disagree that Koppolu illustrates either the visibility of a command, or the use of flags to specify visibility. First, Koppolu does not describe the visibility of menu commands with respect to one another. At various points in the specification Koppolu describes how menu commands can be merged from both the container and server program, and the various procedures used to determine priority among duplicate commands (*See e.g.*, column 9, lines 5-60). However, at no point is the visibility of commands described.

Second, the Figures of Koppolu do not illustrate the feature of visibility of commands as suggested by the Examiner. Figures 1 and 2 show the top most command of the help menu as highlighted. However, this is most likely due to a user selection because the help heading corresponding to the selected menu is also similarly highlighted. Highlighting a menu selection is completely different than specifying the visibility of a command. Similarly, Figure 4 shows a completely gray menu bar. It is unclear why this menu is gray, and there is no description in Koppolu explaining the significance of the color. However, because the entire menu is gray it does not suggest that Koppolu teaches the feature specifying the visibility of individual commands, and it certainly does not teach using flags to do so.

Because Koppolu entirely fails to teach or suggest each command and command vector having a unique object identifier and a flag specifying visibility, and the Examiner has not put forth any evidence that either flags specifying visibility, or associating visibility with commands or command vectors was well known, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0515/37430.02
Application No.: 09/519,206
Office Action Dated: October 20, 2006

PATENT

Independent claim 24 as includes similar features as claim 1, and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1 above. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection and allow claim 24.

Claims 6-8, and 29-31 are all variously dependent on independent claims 1 and 24, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 24 above. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections and allow claims 6-8, and 29-31.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Date: January 19, 2007

/Michael W. Tieff/
Michael W. Tieff
Registration No. 57, 845

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439